

of good-paying jobs can really hurt when a major employer leaves a community. It's estimated that for every manufacturing job in the United States, it creates as many as four related jobs. So when those jobs pack up and leave, it's a problem.

Focusing funds and awards in areas that have suffered the most, to the areas that have endured major job losses, such as those in my district or Representative BOSWELL's district, will ensure that the money is helping the people in the communities that need it most. These programs will help keep our communities self-sustaining as we work to revitalize our economies.

Ohio has lost over 200,000 manufacturing jobs since 2001, and unfortunately, Representative BOSWELL's district in the home State of Iowa have also lost thousands of jobs. With this amendment, applicants from our areas around our country that have suffered from similar circumstances will be considered a priority when applying for funding through these important programs. New, green industries will be able to grow in areas like Lorain and Akron, Ohio, and in Newton, Iowa, as resources are directed where they are needed most.

I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio for any comments that he may have.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the chairwoman for yielding.

We have no objection to the gentleman's amendment and would commend him for offering it.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman from Iowa is prepared to yield back, we are prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. BOSWELL. I am prepared to yield back my time. I thank the gentleman for the support, and the ranking member, thank you very much. Ms. SUTTON, thank you for your support. We encourage passage of the amendment.

And we yield back.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa and the gentlewoman from Ohio for their work on this legislation. I urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. EHLERS

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 110-603.

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. EHLERS:

Page 3, line 10, through page 4, line 17, strike section 102, and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1125, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

□ 1730

Mr. EHLERS. Thank you, Madam Chairman. I appreciate the recognition.

This amendment is very important in terms of the total research effort of our Nation. H.R. 5819 would increase the Small Business Innovation Research program set-aside from 2.5 percent to 3 percent, a 20 percent increase. It would also increase the Small Business Technology Transfer program set-aside from 0.3 percent to 0.6 percent, a 100 percent increase. My amendment would remove these increases and keep the current set-asides in place at 2.5 percent for SBIR and 0.3 percent for STTR.

This is an extremely important issue. The Science and Technology Committee has worked very hard during the last few years to get the America COMPETES authorization bill signed into law. It has now been signed into law. It establishes a funding doubling path for several agencies under Science Committee jurisdiction, several of which are SBIR and STTR funding agencies. However, finding the money to fund these authorizations has not been so easy, and in fact these increased authorizations have not been appropriated.

Several of my colleagues have expressed the opinion that an increase in the set-aside for these two programs was justified by the authorized funding increases in the COMPETES Act. However, as I said, these have not been appropriated.

My concern and my purpose behind my amendment is to make sure that we are not robbing Peter to pay Paul. If we increase the SBIR and STTR program percentages while other agency's funding remains flat, we begin to severely erode our fundamental research base. I would much rather see us fight over extra funding for our basic research programs, our fundamental research programs, of which a percentage would then transfer into SBIR and STTR.

I should point out that my amendment is supported, first of all, by Mr. OBEY, who is chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. He has spoken to me about it, and asked me to specifically mention that he supports my amendment.

I believe it is also supported by a large number of Members, as well as the Association of American Universities, the American Association of Medical Colleges, the Biophysical Society, the Campaign for Medical Research, the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology, the National Association of State and Land Grant Colleges and the Small Business Administration.

To quote the President of the Association of American Universities, the change "would translate directly into cuts in both nominal and real terms in the budgets of most Federal research agencies."

In real terms, the proposed changes would remove approximately \$650 million that is currently provided to researchers, especially those at universities around the country. At the National Institutes of Health, which I believe everyone in this body supports very strongly, if we do not adopt this amendment, the NIH budget would be reduced by \$185 million. That is a severe cut.

So I urge the adoption of my amendment. I think it actually will improve things. I hope that in the next few years we will get substantial increases in the amount of funding for the various research agencies and SBIR and STTR would receive substantial increases to the percentage that they will continue to receive.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Chairman, while not opposed to the amendment, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I appreciate the gentleman's tireless leadership with respect to Federal funding for research and development. It was the gentleman's bill that reauthorized the SBIR program 8 years ago, and he is, therefore, well aware that the amount of Federal research budgets that go to America's small research companies is extremely limited. The fact that innovative small firms have such limited access to Federal research dollars is a problem for our country, and I want to work with the gentleman from Michigan to find a solution that will address this problem.

That said, I understand the gentleman's point of view, and I am going to accept the amendment. As the reauthorization process goes forward, I trust that just as we work in a collaborative, bipartisan manner on the Small Business Committee, that you and I can work together to increase the amount of Federal research dollars available to small firms without raising concerns about the country's critical research priorities.

I would now like to yield to the gentleman from Ohio for any comments that he might have.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I would just comment that we appreciate the chairwoman's willingness to work with the gentleman in accepting his amendment. We would be happy to be part of that conversation. We appreciate your cooperation.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman is prepared to yield